

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

MAR 05 2007

Enclosed is a petition for an extension of time and the appropriate fee.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, and 19-20 are amended to correct typographical errors and/or to recite the subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention. New claims 21-24 are added. Therefore, upon entry of this amendment, Claims 1-24 are pending. The specification is amended as shown to correspond with the claim amendments and to correct typographical errors. The abstract is amended to conform with 37 CFR 1.72(b). No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the amendments and remarks herein.

Claims 9 and 19 were objected to for reciting "a chamber" instead of "a chamfer". Claims 9 and 19 are amended to recite "a chamfer". Applicant respectfully requests this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,609,807 to *Torihara et al.* (hereinafter *Torihara*).

Independent Claim 1 is amended to recite "the light reflecting member includes a chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" which is neither taught nor suggested by *Torihara*. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5-6 are not anticipated based on the amendments to independent claim 1. Similarly, independent claim 11 is amended to recite "the light reflecting member includes a chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" which is neither taught nor suggested by *Torihara*. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-16 are not anticipated based on the amendments to independent claim 11. Since not all of the elements of claims 1 and 11 are taught by *Torihara*,

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN &  
HEID LLP  
2403 MICHELSON DRIVE  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE CA 92612  
(949) 332-7040  
FAX (949) 392-9263

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated, and that claims 5-6, and 15-16 are not anticipated based at least on their dependence from claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Torihara* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,788,356 to *Watai et al.* (hereinafter *Watai*).

As discussed in reference to independent claim 1, *Torihara* does not teach "the chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" as claimed and *Watai* does not remedy this deficiency. Claims 7 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable at least based upon this dependency. Similarly, in reference to independent claim 11, *Torihara* does not teach "the chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" as claimed and *Watai* does not remedy this deficiency. Claims 17 and 19 depend from claim 11 and are believed allowable at least based upon this dependency. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that *Torihara* and *Watai* cannot teach all of the claimed elements in claims 7, 9 17, and 19 even if combined as suggested. Additionally, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion that the chamfer taught by *Watai* may provide enhanced reflection efficiency, and Applicants submit there is no suggestion or motivation to modify *Torihara* in view of *Watai*. Hence, the combination of *Torihara* and *Watai* cannot render obvious claim 1 or claim 11 as amended or claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 that depend therefrom. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN &  
HEID LLP  
2402 MICHELSON DRIVE  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE CA 92614  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 592-9262

Claims 2-4 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Torihara* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,253,089 to *Satoshi Imai* (hereinafter *Imai*).

As discussed in reference to independent claim 1, *Torihara* does not teach "the chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" as claimed and *Imai* does not remedy this deficiency. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable at least based upon this dependency. Similarly, in reference to independent claim 11, *Torihara* does not teach "the chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" as claimed and *Imai* does not remedy this deficiency. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and are believed allowable at least based upon this dependency. Hence, the combination of *Torihara* and *Imai* cannot render obvious claim 1 or claim 11 as amended, or claims 2-4 and 12-14 that depend therefrom. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 2-4 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Torihara* based on *In Re Gazda*, 219 F.2d 449, 104 USPQ 400. In reference to claim 8, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since the structure of independent claim 1, as amended, is not taught by *Torihara*, and a mere reversal of the orientation of claimed elements does not result in the structure taught by *Torihara*. Claim 8 depends from the amended claim 1, and is believed allowable at least based on this dependence. Similarly, in reference to claim 18, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since the structure of independent claim 11, as amended, is not taught by *Torihara*, and a mere reversal of the orientation of claimed elements does not result in the structure taught by *Torihara*. Claim 18 depends from the amended claim 11, and is believed allowable at least based on

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN &  
HEID LLP  
2402 MICHELSON DRIVE  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE CA 92612  
(949) 723-7640  
FAX (949) 392-9262

this dependence. Hence, the mere reversal doctrine taught by *In Re Gazda* cannot properly be applied to render the claimed structure obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Torihara* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,672,733 to *Shinpei Nagatani* (hereinafter *Nagatani*).

As discussed in reference to independent claim 1, *Torihara* does not teach "the chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" as claimed and *Nagatani* does not remedy this deficiency. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable at least based upon this dependency. Similarly, in reference to independent claim 11, *Torihara* does not teach "the chamfer disposed at an edge, the chamfer enhancing a reflection efficiency" as claimed and *Nagatani* does not remedy this deficiency. Claim 20 depends from claim 11 and is believed allowable at least based upon this dependency. Additionally, *Nagatani* does not teach their configuration of light sources provide for shortening the thickness of a back light assembly (*Nagatani* FIG. 13). Further, *Nagatani* teaches the thickness of the guide plate 1 is thicker than a sum of the diameters of the two lamps and a second distance, and is thicker than the diameter of the lamp (*Nagatani* col. 8 line 39 to col. 9 line 9, and FIG. 13). Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation for the position of the lamps taught by *Torihara* to be modified to be in a parallel configuration to shorten or reduce the vertical profile of the backlight assembly. Hence, the combination of *Torihara* and *Nagatani* cannot render obvious claim 1 or claim 11 as amended, or claims 10 and 20 that depend therefrom. Therefore,

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN &  
BEID LLP  
1402 MICHELSON DRIVE  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE CA 92612  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 392-9162

Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

New claims 21-24 are supported by the application as filed (Specification page 7 lines 15-22, page 8 lines 9-10, page 12 lines 12-13, and FIGS. 4, 5, 10, and 12). The specification is amended corresponding to the claim amendments. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Independent claim 21 recites "the highest point of a lower lamp among the two lamps being higher than the lowest point of an upper lamp among the two lamps" that in combination with the remainder of the claimed structure is not taught or suggested by the cited references in any combination. Independent claim 22 recites "the at least two lamps being horizontally disposed" that in combination with the remainder of the claimed structure is not taught or suggested by the cited references in any combination.

Dependent claims 23-24 depend from independent claim 22 and are believed allowable at least based on this dependence.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request all pending objections and rejections be withdrawn. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns about any aspect of this application, a telephone call to the undersigned at (949) 752-7040 is both welcomed and encouraged.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

*Clifford G. Cousins*  
Clifford G. Cousins

March 5, 2007  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

*Clifford G. Cousins*  
Clifford G. Cousins  
Agent for Applicants  
Reg. No. 50,315

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACYBERSON KWOK CHEN &  
REID LLP  
2402 MICHELSON DRIVE  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE CA 92612  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 392-8262